DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 043 425 24 RC 004 698

AUTHOR	Birchard, Bruce A.
TITLE	Education of American Indians: Boarding Schools for American Indian Youth. National Study of American Indian Education, Series IV, No. 2, Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Chicago Univ., Ill.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
BUREAU NO	BR-8-0147
PUB DATE	Jun 70
CONTRACT	OEC-0-8-080147-2805
NOTE	49p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.55
DESCRIPTORS	Achievement, *Administration, *American Indians, *Boarding Schools, Boards of Education, Community Role, Dormitories, *Education, Equal Education, Federal Government, Improvement, Programs, *School District Autonomy, Teacher Attitudes, Teacher Recruitment
IDENTIFIERS	*Bureau of Indian Affairs

ABSTRACT

This document, a part of the final report of the National Study of American Indian Education, examines Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) boarding schools, of which there are 77 among the 226 BIA schools in 17 states. The document concerns itself with the history, value of, and necessity for boarding schools in general. It is pointed out that, in 1969, there were 34,600 Indian children enrolled in BIA boarding schools; 15,450 more in BIA day schools; and 3,850 housed in peripheral dormitories while attending public schools. It is also noted that enrollment in BIA boarding high schools doubled during the period between 1959 and 1967. The document reviews briefly the history of Indian education, with particular emphasis on the boarding school since its beginning at Carlisle Indian School in 1878. Educational programs administered to the Indians by the U.S. Government dating back to 1776 are discussed. Recommendations for the administration of Indian education, along with the Indian point of view regarding boarding schools and education in general, are included. The bibliography lists 63 references. (EL)

BR-8-0147
PA 24
RC

The National Study of American Indian Education

USOE
PROJECT NO. OEC-0-8-080147-2805

Final Report

ED043425

Education of American Indians

BOARDING SCHOOLS FOR AMERICAN INDIAN YOUTH

Series IV

No. 2

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Bruce A. Birchard
University of Chicago
June, 1970

RC004698

NATIONAL STUDY OF AMERICAN INDIAN EDUCATION

The attached paper is one of a number which make up the Final Report of the National Study of American Indian Education.

This Study was conducted in 1968-69-70 with the aid of a grant from the United States Office of Education, OEC-0-8-080147-2805.

The Final Report consists of five Series of Papers:

I. Community Backgrounds of Education in the Communities Which Have Been Studied.

II. The Education of Indians in Urban Centers.

III. Assorted Papers on Indian Education--mainly technical papers of a research nature.

IV. The Education of American Indians--Substantive Papers.

V. A Survey of the Education of American Indians.

The Final Report Series will be available from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service after they have been announced in Research in Education. They will become available commencing in August, 1970, and the Series will be completed by the end of 1970.

THE NATIONAL STUDY OF AMERICAN INDIAN EDUCATION

Director
ROBERT J. HAVIGHURST
University of Chicago
Lillie House—5801 Kenwood Ave.
Chicago, Illinois 60637
Telephone: MI 3-2055

Associate Director
DR. ESTELLE FUCHS
681 East 24th St.
Brooklyn, N.Y. 11210
Telephone: (212) GE 4-1378

BOARDING SCHOOLS FOR AMERICAN INDIAN YOUTH

Preface

This paper was written by Mr. Bruce Birchard, Research Assistant on the staff of the National Study of American Indian Education, on the basis of his extensive reading of the materials listed in the Bibliography, his attendance at conferences of the research staff of the National Study, and his study of several hundred interviews with Indian parents, students, community leaders and with teachers of Indian schools.

His first draft was discussed critically by a conference group at Albuquerque on June 17, 1970, consisting of the following people.

Willard P. Bass, Indian Education Specialist, Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory

Robert L. Bergmann, M.D., Indian Health Service, Window Rock, Arizona

Wayne Holm, Formerly Director, Rock Point Boarding School, Arizona

Dillon Platero, Director, Rough Rock Demonstration School, Chinle, Arizona

Joe S. Sando, All-Pueblo Council, Albuquerque, New Mexico

William Vineyard, Southwestern Technical Institute, Albuquerque

Estelle Fuchs, Associate Director, National Study of American Indian Education

Robert J. Havighurst, Director, National Study of American Indian Education

Their comments and criticisms were used by Mr. Birchard in this final revision of the paper.

Robert J. Havighurst, Director
National Study of American Indian Education

Advisory Committee

ROBERT L. CHISHOLM, Superintendent
Albuquerque Public Schools

LESLIE W. DUNBAR, Executive Director
The Field Foundation

DANIEL HONAHNI, Education Coordinator
Hopi Tribal Council

JUDGE MARY KOHLER, Director
National Commission on Resources for Youth

RONNIE LUPE, Chairman
White Mountain Apache Tribal Council

DOMINGO MONTOYA, Chairman
All Pueblo Council

EDWARD SPICER
Professor of Anthropology
University of Arizona

SOL TAX
Professor of Anthropology
University of Chicago

MELVIN THOM, Executive Director
National Indian Youth Council

RALPH W. TYLER, Director Emeritus
Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences

JAMES WILSON, Indian Desk
Office of Economic Opportunity

JOHN WOODENLEGS, Chairman
Tribal Council of the Northern Cheyenne

INTRODUCTION

The Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) operates 226 schools in 17 states; 77 of these are boarding schools. In 1969, 34,600 American Indian children were enrolled in BIA boarding schools, 15,450 more in BIA day schools, and 3,850 housed in peripheral dormitories while attending public schools with BIA financial support.(48, p.55) Of the 34,600 Indian children in boarding schools, more than 12,000 attend the nineteen off-reservation boarding schools. For the most part, these provide a high school education for Indian children who have completed the eighth grade. The remaining 22,600 pupils are in on-reservation boarding schools. Approximately 18,500 of these children are Navajo. As of 1967, approximately 8,000 students nine years old and under were attending and living in BIA boarding schools; these were almost all Navajos (46,p.253). In addition, there are over 4,000 Indian students living in BIA "bordertown dormitories" while attending public schools.

It is important to recognize that enrollment in BIA boarding schools is not decreasing. In fact, the reverse is true. Between 1959 and 1967, enrollment in BIA boarding high schools doubled; it rose from 5,660 in 1959 to 11,650 in 1967 (48,p.55). This is due in part to a rapidly increasing Indian population. The present growth rate of the Indian population is approximately 2.5 percent per year, or roughly two and one-half times the national rate of increase.

This paper will examine the Bureau of Indian Affairs boarding schools. It will be concerned with the history, value, and necessity of boarding schools in general and with evaluations of specific schools. Much of the information in this paper has been culled from the seven volumes of the Hearings before the Subcommittee on Indian Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the United States Senate, plus three of the Committee Prints: Field Investigation and Research Reports, A Compendium of Federal Boarding School Evaluations, and the Final Report of the Subcommittee, Indian Education: A National Tragedy--A National Challenge. It should be recognized that the purpose of the Subcommittee was to investigate the inadequacies of Indian education; hence, most of its reports stress the faults much more than the positive aspects of Indian schools.

This review of federal boarding school commences with a brief history of Indian education. Then the elementary boarding schools, most of which are on the Navajo Reservation, will be considered. The off-reservation boarding schools will be examined next. Finally, the administration of federal schools and the issue of local control will be covered.

HISTORY

The history of U. S. government concern for American Indian education dates from the birth of the nation, when the Continental Congress moved to station a few ministers and teachers among the northern tribes in 1776 in order to gain their support in the fight against Britain. Though conducted almost entirely by missionaries until late in the 19th century, the federal government was concerned with education throughout this period, for they felt that the

influence of teachers was essential in keeping the Indians friendly as well as making them economically self-reliant. Indeed, the policy of educating Indians so that they might participate in the national economy and thus be assimilated goes back to George Washington, who favored such a policy so that the "blessings of civilization" could be imparted to Indians (2,pp.27-30).

By 1824, twenty-one Indian schools were in operation, all but three of which were in the eastern part of the country. Following the passage of the Removal Act in 1830, however, over 70,000 Indians were moved from the East to the area west of the Mississippi River. Meanwhile, "manual labor schools" were organized. According to Adams, "the course of study in the manual labor school consisted of 'letters, labor and mechanic arts, and morals and Christianity.'" (2,pp.35-36). In 1833, the Choctaws started a comprehensive school system of their own with twelve schoolhouses and non-Indian teachers from the East, supported by tribal, missionary, and federal funds (2, p.39).

In the period following 1845, white Americans began pushing westward beyond the Mississippi, and many Indian tribes resisted. As the conflict grew, the U. S. Army assumed the job of "subduing" the Indians. After a Congressional committee toured the west in 1865 to examine the conditions among the Indian tribes, it issued a pessimistic report on the whole situation, noting that teachers and missionaries were very discouraged about their work. The authors felt that the establishment of reservations and a system of education would be a more humane and less costly way of pacifying Indians than military control. It was suggested that "boarding schools remote from the Indian communities" would be a good way to accomplish this, and that stress be placed on preparation for agricultural pursuits. By 1870, the boarding school and the policy of student labor as a way of learning new ways of life were firmly established. As President Grant put it, the purpose of this process was "the civilization and the ultimate citizenship" of Indians (2, pp. 41-47). The government still was minimally involved in this program, however, as most of these schools were run by missionaries.

The real beginning of the federal boarding school system came in 1878 with the founding of the Carlisle Indian School in Carlisle, Pennsylvania, by General Richard Henry Pratt. Pratt's idea was radical for his time: he felt that Indians were equal to non-Indians and were at least as entitled to the "inalienable rights" of American citizens as any other American. In his words, the Indian problem was simply one of convincing the government and Americans in general "that Indians were like other people and could be. . . easily educated and developed industrially. . ."(40, pp.213-214). To achieve this, Pratt felt the essential process to be "immersing the Indians in our own civilization, and, when we get them under, holding them there until they are thoroughly soaked." (40,p.335).

The Carlisle Indian School enrolled children from the mid-western and western tribes and taught them to speak, read and write English, to dress and live like white people, and to perform various tasks which would prepare them for certain trades. One of the most significant aspects of the Carlisle School was its "outing system," which Pratt referred to as the "right arm" of the School, "the supreme Americanizer."(40, p. 311). Adams describes it as follows:

> When the student completed his school training he was placed with a white family for three years. The government paid fifty dollars a year for his medical care and clothing, and his labor was to compensate for the benefits derived from the home situation. (2, p.52).

The purpose of this was clearly to "immerse" the Indian child in the white man's way of life and woo him away from the life his parents led.

The Carlisle School was widely publicized, and the American public soon favored increasing Indian education. Day schools and boarding schools patterned after Carlisle were established in Idaho, Kansas, Minnesota, Nebraska, Oregon, and Indian Territory. Several of these utilized existing military barracks, just as Carlisle had. In 1890, the "Codification of Rules for Indian Schools" was issued: "Attendance was compulsory, and the agent was responsible for keeping the schools filled by persuasion if possible, by withholding rations or annuities from parents, and by other means if necessary. . . The aim of the school was *preparation for citizenship.*" *(2, pp.53-56). Non-*reservation boarding schools were preferred, since they accomplished the removal of students from the influence of their family and tribe. Between 1889 and 1892, twelve such boarding schools were opened. (2,p.56).

Over the period from 1893 to 1909, however, opinion slowly shifted. Commissioner Frances Laupp (1904-1909) felt that Indian parents should not be deprived of their responsibility for their children and recommended that day schools replace boarding schools. In addition to converting boarding schools to day schools, many Indian children began to be educated in public schools. By 1920, more Indians were in public schools than in federal schools, and by 1928, the number of federal schools decreased by thirty-eight from the number in 1910 (2, pp.61-65).

Some changes in instruction were also made at this time. In 1916, a uniform course of study was adopted. This followed the normal public school program of academic instruction for the first six years of school, with the addition of student labor. Criticisms of the student labor program grew, however, as people came to believe that washing dishes and clothing, making beds, and cleaning dormitories had little relation to vocational skills (2,pp.62-63). Following World War I, appropriations for Indian education were increased. Efforts were made to enroll all Indian children in school, more non-reservation schools began offering high school work, and the amount of student labor was decreased. There was much dissatisfaction with the quality and relevance of the education offered, however, both among the general public and among Indian school personnel. In 1927, morale was so low that personnel turnover in Indian schools reached 48 percent (2, pp. 66-68).

In 1926, at the height of the outrage over Indian education, the Brookings Institute launched an investigation of Indian affairs for the federal government. Under the direction of Lewis Meriam, the education section of the resulting report was written by W. Carson Ryan, Jr., Professor of Education at Swarthmore College. Looking at Indian education from a Deweyian perspective, he argued for individualistic, non-authoritarian, decentralized education in which the

focus would be on the whole child and his relationship to his family and community (32, pp.6-7). Ryan states this in his opening paragraph:

> The most fundamental need in Indian education is a change in point of view. Whatever may have been the official governmental attitude, education for the Indian in the past has proceeded largely on the theory that it is necessary to remove the Indian child as far as possible from his home environment; whereas the modern point of view in education and social work lays stress on upbringing in the natural setting of home and family life (26, p.346).

Ryan's other great concern was that Indian students be treated as individuals. To implement such a goal, he recommended individual bedrooms for every three or four students, smaller classes, less regimentation, and better qualified teachers and matrons--in short, less "institutionalization" of student life in both boarding and day schools.

At the time of the Meriam report, nearly 70,000 Indian children were enrolled in schools. 26,700 of these were in government schools, and over 22,000 of these were in boarding schools, half on and half off the reservations (26, p. 402). In the light of these figures, the report recommended:

> As quickly as possible the non-reservation boarding schools should be reserved for pupils above the sixth grade, and probably soon thereafter for pupils of ninth grade and above. This would leave local schools--public schools wherever possible, government day schools or even small boarding schools where no other arrangement can be made--to take care of all elementary schooling (26, p.403).

The report further suggested that certain off-reservation schools might specialize in particular fields and in caring for special kinds of problem students. It noted that Haskell was already specializing in training for several trades, Chilocco was stressing agriculture, and Albuquerque the arts and crafts of Indians of the Southwest. It was the opinion of the authors that such specialization could be increased:

> Some of these schools might well become special schools for distinctive groups of children: for the mentally defective that are beyond the point of ordinary home and school care, for trachoma or tuberculosis groups. . .for extreme "behavior problem" cases. . .(26, p. 405).

As we shall see, many of these same recommendations are being made today. Due in large part to a kind of "bureaucratic inertia," little has been done by the Bureau to implement them in the past.

Interestingly enough, Ryan did feel that there was one particular value in the off-reservation boarding school, namely: "in furnishing new contacts

and in adjusting adolescents to conditions different from those found on the reservation. . ."(26, p.405). This particular feeling--that experiences in the non-Indian world are important for Indian children to have--is echoed in several ways in the report. Ryan speaks highly of the Carlisle "outing system" and suggests that a similar plan could be used in training Indians in vocational skills (26, pp.389-390). He quotes Malcolm McDowell, Secretary of the Board of Indian Commissioners, in describing the purpose of education as essentially "the training of all Indians for the best type of American citizenship, looking to their absorption into the general citizenship of the Nation." (26, p.348). Thus, despite the radical nature of some of the changes recommended by the Meriam report, we should realize that the basic goal of education--the assimilation of American Indians in the dominant society, together with their economic improvement--remained the same. As Spicer has stated:

> The view of education implicit in the Meriam report was that of individuals being socialized in monocultural situations by an instrument conceived and manned by representatives of the dominant society. . . This is the view which has prevailed ever since in the Bureau of Indian Affairs (50, p.36).

The suggestions in the Meriam report, therefore, were recommendations concerning changes in the means by which the traditional goal of Indian education was to be implemented, not changes in the goal itself.

The government began making changes in the education of Indians soon after the publication of the Meriam report. By 1932, several boarding schools had been converted to day schools, and a few others were simply closed. High school grades were added in the remaining boarding schools, and improvements were made in the academic curriculum and vocational training. The qualifications necessary for teaching were raised; student labor was curtailed; and the care of students improved. In the day schools, efforts were made to serve the Indian community in various ways.(2, pp.70-73).

In 1934, a new president--Franklin D. Roosevelt, a new Secretary of the Interior--Harold Ickes, and a new Commissioner of Indian Affairs--John Collier, began working on a "new deal" for American Indians. Collier stated his feelings about the purpose of the Bureau of Indian Affairs as follows:

> I see the broad function of Indian policy and Indian administration to be the development of Indian democracy and equality within the framework of American and world democracy. . .The most significant clue to achieving full Indian democracy within and as a part of American democracy is the continued survival, through all historical change and disaster, of the Indian tribal group, both as a real entity and a legal entity (28, p.3).

Under the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934, efforts were made to restore Indian land to the tribes and increase the power of tribal governments in running their own affairs. The most important educational policy, however, was the commitment to public education. The Johnson-O'Malley Act (1934) was an important aid to

this; it provided for federal aid to states which had Indian students enrolled in public schools (52, p. 100).

The effects of the new policies were several. Between 1933 and 1943, Bureau boarding schools decreased in number from forty to thirty-one; off-reservation boarding schools decreased from twenty-five to eighteen; and day schools increased from one hundred thirty-two to two hundred sixteen. During the same period, Indian enrollment in the BIA day schools jumped from 6,800 to 21,600. Indian schools emphasized vocational training, even at the elementary level. For the most part, off-reservation secondary schools provided industrial training, while reservation schools offered work in agriculture and stock-raising. Another goal was wider English literacy; between 1930 and 1940, adult Indian illiteracy fell from 33 percent to 25 percent. Other changes included the introduction of Indian arts and crafts into the school program, the preparation of a few bilingual textbooks for Navajo and Sioux, more adequate training of school personnel in summer institutes, and the construction of new schools with full facilities (e.g., libraries, laboratories, workshops) and better dormitories for the resident children. In addition, more Indians were employed by the Bureau. In 1940, over 25 percent of the teachers in Indian schools were Indian (one-fourth or more Indian blood), and 60 percent of the Indian Service personnel were of Indian descent. The primary goal of the entire educational program was the "attainment of economic independence" by the Indian; this was believed possible only through a program which dealt with each Indian child as a "whole person" rather than simply instructing him in special facts and skills (2, pp. 81-95).

During World War II, the pace of change and improvement slackened, but, after the war, efforts were renewed to provide a better education for Indians. One of the more dramatic efforts was the Navajo Special Education Program. The Navajos, most of whom had resisted formal education in the past, experienced much more contact with non-Indian society during the war and began to want education for themselves and their children. In response to this, the Special Education Program was developed. According to a report on the program in 1955:

> The Special Program is a five- to eight-year vocational program which was developed to meet the basic requirements of adolescent Indian people between the ages of twelve to twenty who have had little or no previous schooling.
>
> The main objectives of the Special Program are a basic knowledge of written and spoken English, as well as the development of vocational and other skills necessary to successful living in communities off the reservation (14, p.1).

This program began as a pilot project at Sherman Institute in 1945, enrolling 245 Navajo students. By 1956, 5,000 pupils were enrolled in ten schools under this program (52, p. 99).

Despite this and other efforts, the post-war population boom among Indians and the increasing demands on the part of all Americans for universal education through high school led to a situation in which great numbers of

Indians were not being provided an education. In 1953, for example, 14,000 Navajos--half of the school-age Navajo population--were not in school. Efforts to give more responsibility for the education of Indian citizens to the states were increased, particularly since several studies conducted at this time supposedly demonstrated that Indian students in public schools learned more than those in federal schools. (It should be noted that these studies did not take into account the fact that BIA schools taught the least acculturated students and other students with severe educational and personal problems.) The passage of Public Law 815 and Public Law 874 in 1950 made funds available to the states to help in the construction, maintenance, and operation of public schools enrolling Indian pupils from tax-free Indian lands (52, p.100). In 1953, Indian Commissioner Glenn Emmons stated:

> So as not to separate children from their parents at the tender or formative years, Indian children shall be educated, so far as possible, within their home environment, at least through the elementary grades. Educational opportunities are to be provided in public schools if they are available or can be made available for Indian children equally with other children (52, p.102).

Today, all Indian children residing in California, Idaho, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, New York, Oregon, Washington and Wyoming, plus a great number in other states, are educated in public schools.

In addition to sending Indian children to public schools near their homes, a special program to board Indian students in dormitories in towns or cities where they could attend public schools was initiated in the early 1950s. The dormitories were operated by the Bureau, and federal funds covered the costs of educating the Indian children, but the actual formal education was conducted in the public school. This "bordertown" program has been used most widely in Arizona, New Mexico, Oklahoma and Utah. In 1956, 2,150 Indian students lived in Bureau dormitories and attended public schools (55, p.32);by 1968, this number had nearly doubled to 4,200 (56, p.29-30). The reason for instituting this program was a belief that the association of Indians with non-Indians in public schools would promote acculturation and the easy use of the English language (32,p.11).

In implementing the transfer of Indian students to public schools, it was emphasized that they should be given <u>equal</u> treatment; this meant that Indians should go through the same program as non-Indians. While this policy was clearly meant to prevent unfavorable discrimination against Indians, it also meant that no provisions were made for the special needs of many Indian children who were attending public schools. Moreover, this policy of the transfer of responsibility for the education of Indians from the federal to state governments seemed consistent with the termination policy established in the early 1950s. House Concurrent Resolution 108, passed in 1953, declared Congress' intent to terminate federal relations with Indian tribes as soon as possible. The few tribes which were "terminated" suffered great social and economic losses, and fear of termination has affected Indian perceptions of new programs and policies ever since (17, p.1421).

The policy of state responsibility for Indian education has continued, however, and the BIA now provides education only for those Indians who live in isolated areas without public schools or who have special educational, social, emotional, or "family" problems. Meanwhile, the philosophy of education which dominated the Bureau throughout the 1960s has remained essentially the same as that advanced in the Meriam report: the development of the individual Indian in all respects for participation in the dominant society. According to a 1968 Bureau publication:

> Federal schools are operated for Indian children living on Indian-owned or restricted trust lands to prepare them for successful living. In Federal schools children develop basic academic skills, acquire an understanding of the social and economic world which surrounds them, learn improved standards of living, follow practices which assure optimum health, acquire necessary vocational training to qualify for gainful employment, and obtain sufficient education to enter special schools and institutions of higher learning (56, p.3).

A policy of respect for Indian language and culture and a growing concern that Indians should decide for themselves where and how they spend their lives and educate their children may temper this philosophy somewhat, but basically it remains one of preparing the Indian for social and economic success in the dominant society with little regard for his own social and cultural milieu.

THE ELEMENTARY BOARDING SCHOOLS

In considering Federal elementary boarding schools, we shall be speaking almost exclusively of schools in the Navajo Area. On the Navajo Reservation approximately 20,000 children attend 48 federal boarding schools. 7,500 of these children are under the age of ten. These pupils represent 83 percent of the Navajo population of this age (49, p.78). Of these 7,500 children in BIA boarding schools, 95 percent are there because there is no public or federal day school available for them to attend (48, p.46).

The Need

A question frequently raised about these boarding schools is: how necessary are they? Navajo families are scattered over a large, rugged area with very few all-weather roads. The policy of the Bureau of Indian Affairs is that, in order for a child to attend a day school, he must live within one and one-half miles of a school bus line, and the bus ride to school should not exceed one hour each way.(47,p.58). Many people have expressed the opinion that, if the BIA pushed a comprehensive program of road-building on the Navajo Reservation, they could eliminate the need for most of the elementary boarding schools, since most students would be able to reach existing federal or public schools by bus (41, p.18). BIA data indicate that 64 percent of the Navajo children in boarding schools live within twenty-five miles of the boarding school they attend (47,p.55). The Subcommittee on Indian Education felt, therefore, that "more and better roads would eliminate the need for many of the boarding facilities." (47, p.57).

The feasibility of such a plan has been much debated. Allen Yazzie, Chairman of the Navajo Education Committee, stated in 1968, "Recent surveys have shown that it would take one mile of road to pick up four or five students." (47, p.56). The Director of the Navajo Area informed the Subcommittee that "a total of 1,689 miles of road could be built at the cost of $84,450,000; these roads would allow students to be bussed daily to and from presently existing boarding schools." He notes, however, that "there is no assurance the Indian families would continue to live along these routes for any length of time." (47, p.57).

Other observers, however, feel that the majority of boarding school children could attend on a day school basis with little trouble. Dillon Platero has stated that, at Rough Rock, at least 75 percent of the students could live at home and be bused to school each day, even if little or no improvement is made in the poor roads in the Rough Rock area. It has also been noted that a successful Head Start program is being run on the Navajo Reservation and that parents manage to get their young children to these classes every day. All in all, 2,300 children are transported in small buses to 115 different Head Start sites on the reservation (48, p.70). These facts, coupled with the relative proximity of most students to the boarding schools at which they live, suggest that, with more emphasis on day school programs, the great majority of Navajo children could live at home while attending school.

Dr. Robert Leon, a psychiatrist and severe critic of elementary boarding schools, has stated unconditionally that these institutions should be abolished:

> In my opinion there should be no Indian boarding schools for children in the elementary grades. I say this without qualification. These schools do more harm than good. They do not educate, they alienate. Those children who have families should remain with their families, and those children who are so unfortunate as to not have families should be placed in adequate foster homes. . . The education of children who are geographically isolated does present a problem, but modern technology should and must be used to solve this problem. . . If distances are too great for bussing, teams of educators or groups of children could be transported at regular intervals to central locations by airplane or by helicopter. A child does not have to be in school 6 hours every day to learn what is necessary. Several decades ago no one thought of wrenching the children of rural farm families from their parents to give them schooling. . . Something like the one-room schoolhouse may not be outmoded for the Navajo Indian Reservation (23, pp.2153-2154).

Whatever the educational need for boarding schools may be, it is clear that these institutions meet other important needs of the Navajos. While the children are at the boarding schools, they are assured of clothing, sufficient food, laundry services, a warm place to sleep and work, etc. A great number of Navajo families would have difficulty providing for their children throughout the entire year. A Public Health Service study has demonstrated that the incidence of nutritional anemia in Navajo children rises over the summer but that, by mid-winter, this condition has been corrected in children in the boarding schools (63). Furthermore, studies of Navajo preschool children show more of them to be below the third percentile in height and weight than is true of school-age children. "The older children were possibly better nourished because of the school feeding program."(62, p. 1369). Navajo parents are aware of these problems, and this may be an important reason for them to support the continued existence of boarding schools.

There are other explanations for the Bureau's failure to convert to a day school operation on the Navajo Reservation. The trend in recent years in the Navajo area, as well as elsewhere in the United States, has been to consolidate small schools so as to be able to provide "fuller" programs in larger institutions. Moreover, as Holm has pointed out, the increase in public schools on the Navajo Reservation has "depleted" the number of children eligible for BIA schools in some areas. The public schools want the Indian students, for then they are eligible for Johnson-O'Malley and Public Law 815 and 874 funds. In 1967-68, approximately 18,000 Navajo students, age six to twenty, attended public schools (47, p. 48). To compensate for the loss of children to these schools, the BIA must take students from farther and farther away to fill their large, consolidated schools. As a result, it becomes more difficult to bus students each day, due to the increasing distances involved. It would, of course, be rather difficult for the BIA to abandon these relatively new buildings altogether. For these reasons, as well as the bureaucratic tendency to simply go on running things the way they have "always" been run, over half of the Navajo students still attend and live at boarding schools.

Emotional Problems and Life in the Dormitories

It appears that the elementary boarding schools may not be phased out in the near future. Thus, it behooves us to examine the kind of life students lead in these schools and the criticisms that have been made of it. In a talk entitled "Mental Health Considerations in the Indian Boarding School Program," Leon summed up the basic problem as he saw it:

> I would now like to discuss with you in some detail an emotional problem which is present in 100 percent of the boarding school population. The problem I refer to is the emotion aroused in the child as a result of separation from his parents. Every child who comes to a boarding school must separate for at least a period of several months from his parents. This separation and the feelings thus aroused not only make the child unhappy but the feelings also affect his potential to learn and, as has been documented by certain studies, may very well affect his potential for achieving normal physical growth and development. The damage caused to the child by his separation is directly related to the child's age and the length of time that he is separated from the parents. I am aware that most of the children in the Indian boarding schools are of high school age. As far as I can determine from studying the literature, there is no serious irreversible damage which can occur to the adolescent as a result of separation from his parents. Separation can, however, produce some serious effects on elementary school age children, particularly those children age five to eight. . . There is no doubt that all elementary school age children are tremendously unhappy when separated from their parents and show many emotional symptoms which may or may not be irreversible (21, p. 2205).

Basically, Leon feels that children sent to boarding schools are lonely and feel rejected. He thinks that many symptoms of regression will be found among such children, including crying and striving for attention. More serious problems might include childhood schizophrenia and severe neuroses, particularly withdrawal(21, pp. 2204-2206). Unfortunately, no hard data relevant to this question seem to exist. Moreover, since some parents check their children out quite regularly on weekends, this may be slightly over-stated.

Other psychiatrists agree that young children are apt to suffer psychological damage in boarding schools. Dr. Robert L. Bergman believes that, though the incidence of psychosis in Indian boarding school youngsters seems no higher than it is in the urban middle class population, the incidence of less severe behavior disorders is probably higher. For the most part, these disorders seem to be "patterns of passive resistance" which the children have adopted. Such children are often suspected by their teachers of being mentally retarded, for they learn nothing in school, yet Bergman finds that they can perform non-scholastic tasks--especially Navajo ones--very well (6, pp, 1124-1125). It is

quite possible that these patterns of passive resistance may be a function of limited comprehension in English and consequent failure to understand rather than any deliberate or "cultural" resistance.

The cause of such problems as the psychologists and psychiatrists see it, however, is that separation of the child from the family and the quality of the dormitory life. Boarding school children are often separated from their parents for most of the school year. One teacher reported:

> Most children on the reservation, starting at age six, only see their parents on occasional weekends, if that often. At these times, parents are usually "allowed to check out their children"--if the child's conduct in school warrants it in the opinion of the school administration (47, p.63).

Restrictions regarding the "checking out" of resident children, of course, are the result of official anxiety about "runaways."

At at least one boarding school that we know of, on the other hand, many parents check their children out for almost every weekend. Moreover, weekly movies and athletic events at the school are attended by many parents. The school is the social center for most of the young people, and a majority of the official community events either take place at the school or are sponsored in part by the school (27, p.4). Thus a range of practices exists. The differences between schools may depend partly on the location of the school and the nature of the surrounding community and partly upon the attitudes of the administrators at the different schools.

Whatever the policies are regarding checking children out, there is no doubt but what boarding school children spend a great deal of time in the dormitories. These vary from school to school, too. Some have been described as totally impersonal institutions with stark, uncomfortable facilities and little or no privacy (47, p.64). A few, particularly Rough Rock and Rock Point, have been pictured much more favorably in terms of physical plant and "atmosphere." Nevertheless, it does appear that most dormitories are understaffed, and that most aides have little training for their jobs. The overall ratio of students to aides in the elementary boarding schools approximates sixty to one, and when one considers that fewer than half of these are on duty at any one time, the ratio becomes one hundred and twenty or more students to one aide. There is also evidence that aides in many schools are discouraged from counseling or becoming personally involved with the children (47, p. 61). Though official policy, as set out in the BIA Handbook for Teacher and Dormitory Aides (1968), states that aides should try to create a family atmosphere in the dormitory, observers have noted at more than one school that this goal is not accomplished (cf 11, p. 41). Moreover, aides in most schools must devote considerable time to housekeeping chores. As a consequence, regimentation is severe and children may have no adult to whom they relate and with whom they can share their troubles or achievements.

Though many people agree that boarding schools are a poor way to educate young children, few offer solutions. Dr. Bergman is one exception. He feels that a very significant improvement would be made by increasing and improving the staffing of dormitories. The Indian Health Committee of the American Academy of Pediatrics has recommended that at least one dormitory attendant be on duty for every fifteen children in the dorms at any time. Bergman feels that, if the number of aides were increased by a factor of four, and if all were encouraged to work closely with the children, life would be much better for the children involved. These aides must be trained so that they will no longer be guided by the principle of treating all children the same way. But this increased staffing and training require that the elementary student's life in the dormitory be recognized as being just as important as his formal education in the classroom (5, pp. 1128-1133).

The Bureau of Indian Affairs is beginning to act on this basis in the Navajo boarding schools. In several schools, a dormitory parent program has been tried. Parents living near the school are temporarily employed in the dormitories. This provides more aides and thus gives all more time to spend with the children. It also stresses the need for aides to act as "substitute parents."(5, p. 1132).

At the Rough Rock Demonstration School, many efforts have been made to improve dormitory life. Four students share a room, which they may decorate as they wish. The living rooms include a half hogan, a mural of Navajo life, and a loom and Navajo rug. The ratio of aides to students is one to fifteen. Unfortunately, this increase in the number of aides, as well as other aspects of the Rough Rock program, is possible only because of special funding from the Office of Economic Opportunity; it would not be possible on Bureau funding alone.

The Educational Experience

Two important aspects of the educational experience require a brief examination: the teachers and the curriculum. Teachers in the Navajo Area tend to be relatively young compared with teachers in other areas of the BIA system; 42 percent are between the ages of 20 and 29. Only 12 percent of the instructional staff are of Indian descent. Thirteen percent have Master's degrees. The turnover rate is roughly 20 percent per year (47, pp.84-86).

Various observers and investigators report that only a minority of teachers have had much special training or preparation for working with Navajo children. A two-week (or less) orientation program is generally provided BIA school employees, but this is felt by many to be too brief to matter much (47, pp.88-89). One school at which teachers appear to have some background in Navajo culture is Rough Rock. Erickson and Schwartz report that, of the teachers there:

> Many of them were Navaho, an advantage which, according to classroom observations. . . may have been considerable. In addition, some Anglo teachers at Rough Rock had at least a working knowledge of the Navaho language. Rough Rock's teachers said they wanted Navaho elements in the curriculum, though they may have differed on how much there should be. . . They were not preoccupied with pupil control (11, p.6-41).

Perhaps more teachers on the Navajo Reservation will be encouraged to follow this example.

Another aspect of the "teacher problem" is the relative isolation of most teachers from the Indian community. Housing is provided for Bureau teachers in a compound separated from the rest of the community. At Shonto, investigators found that teachers leave the community every weekend or so for recreation in larger towns some fifty to one hundred fifty miles away, and few if any teachers made an effort to get to know local Navajos. Most seemed to feel that they would be at Shonto for no more than a few years anyway, and this expectation is justified by the fact of high turnover. Both the expectation that they will not be at Shonto long and the fact that most teachers do leave after a year or so make real familiarity with the community unlikely for most teachers (28, p.9).

The major complaints about the curriculum in Navajo schools are that it is largely "irrelevant" to the Navajo students and that it does not allow for the native students' lack of language skills in English. As for the latter point, the BIA has initiated TESL (teaching English as a Second Language) programs in all Navajo Area elementary schools. Several drawbacks to the program have been noted, however. For one thing, teacher training efforts to date have been too limited to assure that teachers develop the necessary specialized skills for using the program. Second, the materials in use so far have been ones constructed with a Spanish-English bias (47, pp. 90-91). Finally, some linguists believe that teaching a young child English, even with the TESL method, before he develops real proficiency in speaking and thinking in his native language can impair his ability to think abstractly later. If a pupil who is still struggling with English vocabulary is taught mathematics, literature, science, etc. in English, the youngster is faced with the problem of learning both new words in a relatively unfamiliar language and mastering new, often abstract concepts at the same time. Moreover, the fact that he has been taught in school primarily in English means that his vocabulary in his native language is relatively restricted, being composed mostly of the words and concepts which are common in everyday, informal conversation. Thus, he cannot even think through the new concepts he is supposed to learn, in his native language. An alternative method of teaching would be a program of "bilingual education," in which children are taught in their own language until they understand the new ideas and concepts being presented. Proficiency in abstract thinking in the native language is thus encouraged. After students become familiar with the new ideas, they could be taught the English words for the new concepts. In this way, it is reasoned, they would understand much better what the English words meant(Wayne Holm, pers. com.).

The curriculum in Indian schools is often criticized for being irrelevant to Indian students due to its general use of traditional programs in history and the use of reading materials based on Anglo cultural experience. The Navajo Area Office began a project of curriculum revision for Navajo schools in 1967; in their 1968-69 progress report they stated:

> Work will continue toward developing Navajo Area Curriculum. Suggested distinctive needs which make Navajo education unique will be evaluated and tested. A wide variety of materials through which these needs can be met will be evaluated. Priorities will be set for the actual writing of the curriculum documents, and consultants will be selected to assist Area and Agency committees in developing first drafts (33, p.91).

The most innovative approach to the educational experience is the program at Rough Rock. Erickson and Schwartz reported:

> Some of the best instruction we have seen anywhere was occurring at Rough Rock, in one or two classes taught by Navajo teachers at the primary level. Rough Rock was experimenting with unusually promising techniques of bilingual education. Its efforts to introduce Navaho elements into the curriculum must be regarded as significant steps into an essentially unexplored area. . .(11, p.5.40).

The whole issue of what constitutes a "relevant" curriculum for Indian children, of course, is open to debate. Is such a curriculum one which is oriented to the dominant, non-Indian society, so that (presumably) Indian children will be able to achieve socially and economically in this society? Is it one which is oriented to traditional values and/or ways of life? Should it attempt to include both orientations? Should its aim be to help create a new way of life which is neither traditional Indian nor contemporary American, but which shares aspects of both? One question which remains unanswered is: to what extent do Indian people want their children to receive an education which is significantly different from that received by middle-class white children? Do they see any disadvantages in this kind of program? Some may feel that their children will not be able to compete for jobs in the dominant society if their education is not "just like everybody else's." Clearly, the attitude concerning the ideal curriculum will vary from reservation to reservation and even from family to family.

Community Involvement with the Schools

In the past, the elementary boarding schools have been completely under the control of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Most Navajo parents knew nothing more about the schools than what they experienced if and when they attended. Many parents were too reticent to feel comfortable in the strange school, and the staff members of some schools apparently added to this discomfort. Observers at Shonto noted that when parents came to take children home for the weekend, very little communication with teachers transpired. Until recently, there have been no institutions (e.g., school boards) through which they could become involved or exert some influence. Mrs. Annie Wauneka, a representative of the Navajo Tribe, described how the BIA closed a community school despite the desire of the community to keep it. She observed: "The Navajo Tribal Council has never been asked where they (new schools) will be built, never. They (the BIA) just build them anywhere they wish."(58, p.1001)

Although most Navajo parents still are unfamiliar with the schools, some changes are taking place. In 1966, the Education Committee of the Navajo Tribe met with representatives of the BIA Navajo Area and agreed to cooperate in efforts to reach certain goals, including new curricular programs and greater parental and tribal involvement (47, pp.78-79). The Bureau has also implemented a program whereby advisory school boards are being created for each federal school. Guidelines have been drawn up and workshops planned by the BIA to teach Navajos about the nature, privileges, responsibilities and duties of school boards.

The Navajo Area Director reported in 1968:

> In the school year 1967-68 out of fifty-five installations, fifty-one schools created and operated school boards. . . This year with greater emphasis and special help from the outside consultant in the area of parent-child involvement and school board training and workshops, we expect to have 100 percent operating school boards for the improvement of Navajo education (15, p.79).

Despite these efforts, one investigator has found that the "school board" of one Navajo school had never met until he inquired about it. Moreover, the members had been picked by the principal, with the approval of the Chapter, and three of them were connected with the school through their own or a relative's employment there. As Roessel notes, Navajo school boards are not likely to be assertive anyway:

> This basically is due to the fact that the Navaho school board members are not aware of their potential responsibilities and areas of influence. The superintendent plays the dominant role and meetings are characterized principally by Navaho acquiescence and very little participation (41, p.13).

This phenomenon may also be related to the traditional emphasis on personal autonomy and the reluctance to assert oneself in Navajo culture. However, there is evidence that, once a board has been functioning for some time, and once the members gain some experience and sophistication in schoolboard matters, it begins to operate more autonomously and demand more power. For example, the board referred to above, after it finally started meeting, soon began conducting its sessions in Navajo, which the principal could not understand.

The greatest innovation in this area of community involvement is again the Rough Rock Demonstration School. The school is under the control of a seven-person, all-Navajo school board which is elected by the community. Erickson and Schwartz note:

> Important strides were made toward achieving community control at Rough Rock, though much distance remained to be covered. Board members were exceptionally well-known in the community, were believed genuinely in control of the school, and were viewed by at least half the parents as responsive to community opinion. The school was a remarkably focal community institution. Contacts between classroom and home were frequent, though not as frequent as school leaders suggested they should be. Nearly half the parents had participated in adult education classes. Most of them felt the school was rather well attuned to their wishes. . . (11, p.3.51).

These same investigators, however, concluded that the board had little to do with the employment or dismissal of professional personnel or with budgetary matters. They were active instead in the employment of local non-professionals, in the area of community development (including adult education and Head Start classes), and in decisions about the inclusion of Navajo culture in the school life and curriculum (11, pp.3.13-3.14)--in short, in areas which involve and affect the Navajo community most directly. This is not surprising. It seems naive to expect the area of expertise and greatest concern of this school board to be methods of classroom instruction or school administration.

In concluding this section, it is worth quoting a letter from Raymond Nakai, Chairman of the Navajo Tribal Council, to the Senate Subcommittee on Indian Education which demonstrates that the BIA boarding schools, despite their drawbacks, are looked upon favorably by at least some Navajos:

> According to reports in national newspapers, testimony before your committee by Senator Mondale and Dr. Karl Menninger has shown the Bureau of Indian Affairs boarding schools in an unfavorable light. The Navajo people are quite concerned about this matter. Will you please advise us what evidence, if any, was submitted in proof of this adverse testimony. . .
>
> BIA boarding schools on the Navajo reservation were built and are operated through the close cooperation of the Navajo Tribe, the parents of Indian children, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. If there is a better way to educate children, we think it should be discussed with the Navajo Tribe and the Navajo people. Until that time it is the request of the Navajo people that the boarding school program on the Navajo Reservation be expanded by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, working closely with the Navajo Tribe and the Navajo people, and we request that this be continued until concrete evidence is submitted and that no precipitous action be taken without complete information (31, p.2184).

Whether or not this official view of the Tribal Council is shared by all Navajos cannot be decided here, but it should serve as a note of caution to anyone who assumes that all Indians must be "down" on BIA boarding schools.

THE OFF-RESERVATION BOARDING SCHOOLS

Whereas most elementary school age Navajo children attend boarding schools because of the lack of day school facilities near their homes, many additional reasons exist for the placement of older children in off-reservation boarding schools.

Admission Policies

The criteria for admission to off-reservation schools are as follows:

Education criteria

1. Those for whom a public or Federal Day School is not available;
2. Those who need special vocational or preparatory courses;
3. Those retarded scholastically 3 or more years; or
4. Those having pronounced bilingual difficulties.

Social criteria

1. Those who are rejected or neglected by their families and for whom no suitable alternative care can be made;
2. Those who belong to large families with no suitable home and whose separation from their siblings is undesirable;
3. Those whose behavior problems are too difficult for solution by their families or through existing community facilities; or
4. Those whose health or proper care is jeopardized by illness of other members of the household (46, p.254).

The proportions of students admitted to boarding schools for these two types of reasons vary from school to school. According to investigators for the Senate Subcommittee on Indian Education, 80 percent or more of the students at Busby, Flandreau, Pierre, Sherman and Stewart Indian Schools were sent for "social" reasons. A large proportion of the students at Albuquerque, Chilocco, and Seneca Indian Schools are also there for these reasons. On the other hand, it appears that a majority of the students at Intermountain (Navajo), Mt. Edgecumbe (Alaskan native), and Chemawa (Alaskan native and Navajo) are there because of the lack of high school facilities in their home areas (46, pp.263-432).

The actual mechanics of admission involve students, parents, and BIA personnel. The evaluators of Pierre Indian School in South Dakota state:

> The action sending children to Pierre is a bureaucratic process, starting usually with the reservation school principal, education specialist, or welfare worker. The "application" is reviewed in an area office at Aberdeen and sent on to Pierre authorities. . . "Applications" thus handled are rarely turned down by the school. (12, pp.326-334).

At the Busby Indian School, it is estimated that 75 percent of the requests for admission originate with parents, while 25 percent originate with BIA reservation officials (e.g., a caseworker)(24, p.288). Admission to the

Albuquerque Indian school is usually determined by Bureau representatives in the field. A child who has decided he wants to go to Albuquerque goes to such an official--usually the local BIA school superintendent--who then arranges for his admission (45, pp.272-273). It appears to be the students who are sent to boarding schools for "social" reasons who ordinarily have the least to say about the decision. This determination is made by Bureau social workers on the reservation. Although approval of the parents and of the reservation superintendent are necessary, the application process is generally initiated by social workers, and they are the primary decision agents (48, p.72).

There is evidence that many students entering off-reservation boarding schools transfer from other schools. Approximately 40 percent of the students entering the Albuquerque Indian School, for instance, come from other schools (45, p.265). Many started in public high schools, then dropped out or were pushed out due to severe academic and/or social problems. The Bureau estimates that at least 25 percent of the students in off-reservation boarding schools began in public schools. A few have been sent to boarding schools as an alternative to sending them to a reformatory. Many students move from one boarding school to another each year (48, p.22).

Many of the differences among Bureau boarding schools are due in part to the kinds of students each enrolls. Stewart, Sherman, Pierre, Flandreau, and Chilocco come in for more than their share of criticism, and the difficulties arising from trying to care for and educate a large number of children with social and/or emotional problems appear to be an important reason. An interesting example of the effects of the admissions policy is the Chemawa Indian School in Salem, Oregon. After spending some six weeks observing and interviewing at Chemawa in the winter of 1969, investigators for the National Study of American Indian Education felt that it was, on the whole, a good school. In particular, they noted that morale seemed very high among both staff and students. At this time, approximately 90 percent of the students were Alaskan natives, and the remainder were Navajos. Almost all of them were at Chemawa because there were no schools which they could attend at home. In the fall of 1969, however, the school admitted a number of Indian students from the Northwest who were having severe problems succeeding or even staying in public schools at home. Upon visiting Chemawa in November, 1969, the same investigators found that the school was having considerable trouble adjusting to the changing student body; discipline problems had greatly increased and school morale seemed much lower than the year before. Thus, in evaluating federal Indian schools, we should keep in mind the special problems faced by many of them.

Physical Plant and School Materials

When a student arrives at an Indian boarding school, what sort of facilities is he likely to find? This varies considerably from school to school. The investigating team at Flandreau Indian School reports: "The main instructional offices and the dormitories are quite new and the general aspect of the school is most favorable, comparing with the best public high schools."(12, p.330). At Chilocco, however, Leon noted:

> The physical plant can either facilitate or severely inhibit an attempt to develop an adequate program. In the case of Chilocco, physical plant impedes program development. The buildings are arranged in haphazard fashion. Many of them are old, outmoded, and should be torn down (22, p.300).

At the Oglala Community Boarding School, the evaluators felt that the two high school classroom buildings were inadequate for a truly innovative educational program due to their age and the small size of the rooms. They also note, however, that the cost of renovation would be "prohibitive." (18, p.391). At Oglala, as in many other boarding schools, the dormitory facilities are not especially pleasant; these will be discussed later.

As far as educational materials such as textbooks, audiovisual equipment, tape recorders, libraries, and equipment for shop, home economics, and driver's education are concerned, their adequacy varies from school to school. The Southwestern Laboratory team felt that the Albuquerque Indian School had a wealth of such materials and used them well (45, pp.266-267). At Intermountain, on the other hand, deficiencies were noted in the textbooks and supplementary materials in most of the programs; the supply was inadequate and many texts were outdated. The materials for many special programs, however, seemed exceptional: a modern remedial reading laboratory, two language laboratories for the ESL program, and a driver training simulator were observed by a BIA review team (61, pp.367-368). Sherman Institute seems to be the least prepared in this regard. In 1968, there were not enough textbooks to go around; the library, gym, and main academic buildings had been condemned; and the shops had out-of-date metal and woodworking machines for the students to learn to use (51, p.422). A cutback of nearly 25 percent in the operating budget at Sherman did nothing to remedy this situation (13, p.1). It should be kept in mind, of course, that deficiencies in instructional materials and physical plant are not limited to federal Indian schools.

Teachers

It appears that most federal boarding schools have properly certified teachers. At the Albuquerque Indian School, at least half of the fifty faculty members have their Master's degree (45, p.269). At Busby, one third have their Master's; the remainder have at least a B.S. with a major in the subject being taught (24, p.288). In terms of formal accreditation, therefore, Bureau teachers seem to be better prepared than teachers in many public schools.

Many investigators, however, have felt that there is much room for improvement in the quality of the teaching. The Abt Study reported:

> The primary in-school cause of the low academic achievement levels of Indian students is the inadequacy of the instruction offered them for overcoming their severe environmental handicaps. A great proportion of the teachers in the BIA system lack the training necessary to teach pupils with the linguistic and economic disadvantages of the Indian child successfully (1, p.62).

In essential agreement with this argument are the evaluators of the Pierre and Flandreau schools, who stated:

> Preservice and in-service preparation of teachers must be organized and pushed. It is not humane nor efficient to allow teachers to learn their profession by practicing on the defenseless (12, p.333).

In short, even a teacher well-qualified to teach in a middle-class public school may not be prepared to deal with the special problems of the cross-cultural education of children living in the boarding-school situation. The Waxes have called attention to one of the problems which arises in this situation: the development of a "vacuum ideology" which holds that Indian children are "lacking in experiences" ("culturally deprived"). Such an ideology is frequently held by teachers and administrators in some areas (59, pp.58-79).

Teacher turnover, a real problem in many isolated areas (e.g. Alaska, the Navajo Reservation), is also a problem in some off-reservation boarding schools. At the Busby Indian School, teacher turnover was 25 percent in 1967-68 and 90 percent in 1966-67 (24, p. 288). At the Albuquerque School, on the other hand, the turnover rate is low. The investigating team reported that, with three exceptions, all teachers with whom they talked had been at the school for fourteen to thirty-one years (45, p.2). Whether or not such a low rate of turnover is a good thing can also be debated, of course. The civil service tenure which established Bureau teachers enjoy makes their dismissal practically impossible, and some may rely on this more than on good teaching to keep their positions. Moreover, it is difficult for a principal or superintendent to reward a good teacher, since advancement is strictly according to length of service.

Curriculum

Considerable controversy exists over the curriculum of Bureau boarding schools. Some feel that it should be largely vocational; others think it should be academic and college-preparatory. Many feel that special efforts need to be made in remedial, special education, and ESL programs. Several investigators have questioned how "relevant" the curriculum offerings are to Indian students and, in particular, how much more relevant they would be if there was more concern with the Indian heritage.

To begin with the first question, the policy of the BIA since 1963 has been to provide only prevocational education, on the theory that graduating students could go on to post-secondary vocational schools (48, pp.80-81). Citing this policy, administrators at Chilocco said that they expected vocational education would diminish in importance in the years to come. Yet, at the same time, 50 percent of the students entering the eighth grade at Chilocco fail to graduate, and very few enter college (57, p.303). At Flandreau, the supervisor of the Industrial Arts Department noted the same trend toward an academic curriculum, yet observed that many students seemed more interested in machine and wood shop. He felt that, despite official policy, there was more stress on vocational education than on academic subjects at Flandreau (7, pp.340-351).

At Stewart Indian School, the academic curriculum is definitely second in importance; girls take four years of home economics and boys four years of practical arts:

> Initially students are rotated from one vocational specialty to another. . . until the junior year, after which they spend one-half of each school day in one vocation--either wood shop, metal shop, painting, or farmwork. . . The girls may choose from only two fields--general and home service (domestic work) or "hospital ward attendant" training, which the girls considered a degrading farce--a euphemism (they say) for more domestic work (34, p.419).

Generally this type of vocational training is not very useful to students if they return to their home communities, for few economic opportunities exist on the reservations.

Thus, vocational training programs are often criticized for being inadequate and/or poorly designed. However, BIA schools are also criticized for stressing vocational training too highly at the expense of college preparation (48, pp.60-62). We might conclude that Bureau schools could improve both their academic and vocational programs, but it is difficult to get consensus on where the emphasis should be placed.

Another question of curriculum concerns the importance of remedial and special education programs. Many students enter the boarding schools considerably below the expected level. At Pierre and Flandreau, for instance, first-year students average two and one-half years behind national norms in most subjects (12, pp. 326, 330). This is not unusual. It must be remembered that any Indian student living on federal trust land who is 3 years or more retarded in his academic work may be admitted to a Bureau boarding school. Dr. Glen Nimnicht, in his report on the Stewart Boarding School, states:

> Their (the Indian students) basic problem is that they come to Stewart with academic problems requiring intensive remedial work. Instead of this they get a watered-down, "easy" curriculum (35, p.418).

It appears that this is the case in many federal boarding schools, though some are certainly trying to meet the challenge.

As far as concern with the Indian cultural heritage goes, there has been more recognition of this by the Bureau in the last decade than previously. Some efforts to use Indian adults as interpreters, teacher aides, and teachers of Indian history and culture are being made in some schools in the Southwest. A major effort to emphasize the value of the many tribal cultures has been made at the Institute of American Indian Arts in Santa Fe, New Mexico. Created in 1962 and using the remodeled facilities of the Santa Fe Indian Boarding School, the purpose of the school is to provide an accredited high school program with emphasis on the arts, as well as a post-high school vocational arts program.

Both of these programs prepare students for college, technical schools, or arts-related vocations. Noting that most of the young people at the school suffer from cultural conflict and economic deprivation, Lloyd New, Director of the Institute, explained the philosophy of the school as follows:

> In establishing the Institute of American Indian Arts six years ago, the Bureau recognized the special needs of Indian youth and provided an institution which was set up to make special curriculum provisions geared to their particular needs, in an attempt to turn the potential disadvantage of the cultural transition to advantage and to stimulate extensions of American Indian expressions in the arts.
>
> The underlying philosophy of the program is that unique cultural traditions can be honored and can be used creatively as the springboard to a meaningful contemporary life (36, pp. 1365-1368).

The results of the program, both in the art created and in the students who learn and grow there, are very impressive.

School-Community Relations

Students at most boarding schools seem to be quite isolated from surrounding communities, due to distance from the communities and school rules about leaving campus. Leon observes that Chilocco is "so physically isolated from any community as to make Indian children's relationships with society at large almost impossible." (22, p.300). Richard Hovis, a student teacher at Chilocco, has written:

> They (students) don't have the freedom to take a walk more than one hundred yards from campus. They can't go downtown shopping. They can't go into town and see a movie on a weekend (16, p.319).

At Pierre, students can go into town to shop or see a movie, but only under supervision and only on "town days."(12, p.328). At Albuquerque, on the other hand, students are free to participate in various community activities sponsored by service organizations and schools, and some visit friends at their homes. The majority of students, however, stay on campus most of the time, for this is where their friends are and where they feel at home (45, p. 277). The similarity between this and the situation in many private boarding schools and even colleges is striking.

The situation for students in bordertown dormitories, unfortunately, is not much better. In many communities, these children are unwelcome at churches, school events, and other community activities. Many townspeople may be prejudiced against them. Having only the dormitories in which to amuse themselves, such students may often be worse off for recreational opportunities than students at boarding schools.

Students at some schools do work part-time in surrounding communities. A few students at Albuquerque and the Oglala Community School manage this. At Sherman Institute, however, the Head Counsellor explained that, much as he wanted to arrange for students to get some work experience during the school year, the consequent interference with regular class work made this difficult to arrange. He felt that the scheduling and attendance policies should be more flexible so that such experience could be provided for many students. In the meantime, he helped students get weekend jobs (12, p.1). Students at some other boarding schools participate in programs such as Upward Bound, Neighborhood Youth Corps, and other OEO programs. The overall picture, however, remains one of isolation from the local communities.

School-Reservation Relations

If relations with surrounding communities are few, how close does the student remain to his family and his home community? This varies from school to school. Many students, particularly those who are transported long distances to school (e.g., Alaskans at Chemawa and Chilocco) go home only during the summer, if then. Students from the Southwest at Stewart are not even allowed to go home at Christmas, according to Nimnicht (35, p.420). At Pierre, "Trips home are arranged with difficulty, involving letters to and from parents with attendant bureaucratic delays." (12, p.326). At Albuquerque and Intermountain, the school pays only for the students' transportation to and from home at the beginning and end of the school year, though the students may go home for holidays or weekends at their parents' expense. Some parents instead visit the school to see their children (45, p.273). At the Oglala School, on the other hand, students can return home every weekend if they want to (18, p. 389). Much opposition has been voiced against the real separation from family and community which is effected by the boarding schools, but distance, lack of money, and fears of students running away and/or getting in trouble have led to these restrictive policies.

The Dormitory Program

The dormitory is the student's "home away from home," and he spends a lot of time there. Dormitories have been criticized in many schools. At the Oglala Community Boarding School, they have been described as follows:

> The dormitories have a typical institutional atmosphere. Children sleep in barracks-type rooms which in some cases are overcrowded. Furniture is badly needed. . . Two main problems are evident in the dorms. First, there is an almost complete lack of privacy which is a major cause of dissatisfaction among the older students. Secondly, provisions for study are very poor, particularly in the boys' dorm (18, p.386).

Although somewhat better facilities seem to exist at Intermountain and Chemawa, the lack of privacy and the regimented, institutional atmosphere are common complaints about Bureau boarding school dormitories.

Most schools attempt to provide recreational activities for their students, though a few have difficulties doing so due to lack of staff and funds. At Pierre the investigators observed that, despite severe winters which limited outdoor activities, only two old television sets and a few paperback books were available for students' amusement. The aides tried to hold hobby sessions for small groups of pupils each week, but most of the materials had to be bought by the aides themselves (12, p.328). At the Stewart School things seem somewhat better. Students have two hours of "leisure time" scheduled each evening. Ping-pong and similar games are available in the dormitories; band, 4-H Club, student newspaper, yearbook, athletic teams, home economics clubs, and other activities meet at this time (35, p.419). And at Chilocco, according to Hovis, "There are special educational and cultural activities day and night."(16, p. 319). Thus, opportunities for recreation vary from school to school. It is certain, however, that at every school, students who are accustomed to roaming around a lot at home have some difficulty adjusting to the more confined life of the boarding school.

There are many rules and regulations governing student behavior at the boarding schools. One important set of restrictions covers male-female interaction. Bergman writes that, at off-reservation boarding schools: "The sexes are pretty well kept separate most of the time, and even casual contact between them is looked on with some suspicion by school officials anxious about possible scandal." Bergman feels that students are apt to get in trouble because they must develop and carry on heterosexual relationships on the sly (6, p. 1123). Students at Chemawa complained to interviewers that they were not even allowed to hold hands with their girl-friends and boy-friends on campus.

Feelings about the regimentation and consequent lack of independence were expressed by students at the Albuquerque Indian school in a discussion about dormitory life:

> (1) The senior students resented turning out the light at 9:30 p.m., particularly when they had been assigned by teachers to observe a given television presentation, (2) girls particularly objected to being "marched" across campus at night when they were going to and from one place of activity to another, (3) both boys and girls objected to people entering their room without knocking--the people to whom they were referring were the dormitory aides and department heads, (4) students reacted negatively to "collective" punishment. . .(45, pp. 270-271).

Saslow and Harrover, in their article on psychosocial adjustment of Indian young people, explain how such impersonal treatment develops. School personnel believe that rules and policies must be applied equally to all students. This is seen as the democratic way. It follows that, if all students are to be treated the same, all students should behave the same. When some students do not, their behavior is seen as a transgression of the law, not as coping or reactive adaptations (42, p. 2122).

One of the reasons for the severity of this situation in many schools is the inadequate number of dormitory aides. The Committee on Indian Health of the American Academy of Pediatrics recommends that there should be Instructional Aides on duty for every fifteen students in the dormitories. These aides should be given pre-service and in-service training so that they will be able to function as "parent substitutes." However, the aide to student ratios estimated for several boarding schools are: Busby, 1:25 to 1:50 (24, p. 240); Pierre, 1:60 (12, p. 328); Oglala, 1:50 to 1:75 (18, p. 386); Stewart, 1:26 (35, p. 419). Moreover, since these are the overall ratios of aides to students, the actual ratio of aides on duty to students is much worse.

Most of the dormitory aides in federal boarding schools are Indians, many of whom went to boarding schools themselves during a time when few people questioned the strict, authoritarian approach. Many researchers have commented on the problems which result. At Stewart:

> The guidance staff attempts to ameliorate the school's archaic social rules, but must fight dormitory aides who were educated at Stewart and who believe in and enforce strict discipline and puritanism (35, p. 420).

Unfortunately, most aides have little or no training which would serve to counteract these tendencies.

There is little doubt that many aspects of the dormitory situation should be changed. Improving the physical surroundings, increasing the number of aides, training the aides in the "new philosophy" of the residential school, and relaxing some restrictions is a large order, but it is one that should be filled as soon as possible. Increased appropriations for such a program, of course, are a necessity.

Counseling and Guidance

From all accounts it appears that most boarding schools serve a very diverse population of students. Krush and Bjork identify seven relatively distinct categories of pupils at Flandreau:

1. Individuals of average intelligence having relatively stable home backgrounds and capable of doing academic high school work;

2. Individuals of average intelligence having relatively stable backgrounds and seeking vocational training to enable them to become skilled artisans;

3. Individuals of average intelligence having relatively unstable backgrounds, causing them to be socially dependent and/or neglected;

4. Individuals having physical handicaps which interfere with learning.

5. Individuals who are mentally retarded and incapable of actively participating with members of the preceding four groups;

6. Individuals who are socially maladjusted and pose special problems in their repetitive conflicts with authority; and

7. Individuals having severe emotional conflict, who develop psychoneurotic, psychosomatic, or psychotic reactions (19, pp. 2212-2213).

Though many investigators have decried the practice of separating children from their families, there is no doubt but what a number of children come from poor home backgrounds and may be better off in school. Parmee describes the "skid-row" type family which he identified in twenty-one out of one hundred sample cases studied on the Apache Reservation. "Broken marriages, drinking, . . . poverty, and complacency" were common in these families, and many of their children actually objected to returning to them from boarding school.(38, p.1158). At the Phoenix Indian School, it is estimated that over 200 of the 1,000 students come from broken homes. In addition, 580 students were considered academically retarded (10, p.392).

Some Indian boarding school students show signs of various emotional problems. Drinking and sniffing glue or gasoline have been noted by some investigators. Excessive teasing or fighting have been mentioned as signs of intra-group hostility. Personal isolation, distrust of others, passive withdrawal, and other signs of alienation have been cited by many observers. Krush and Bjork administered the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, the California Psychological Inventory, and the Quay-Peterson Three Factor Scale to Indian high school students at Flandreau. All three tests showed these students to be somewhat closer to psychiatric distress and disorder than is normal for the non-Indian American population. These investigators hypothesized the existence of three basic problems leading to various personality disorders: (1) "Psychosocial nomadism" due to extreme mobility, "a condition which obtains when the child is exposed not only to repeated changes in loci but to repeated changes in the constellation of his meaningful persons"; (2) shifting standards, or confusion over values and norms due to "distinct variations in the value orientations of the students, their relatives, the teachers, dormitory personnel and the administrative staff"; and (3) superficiality of response, resulting from an attempt to match one's values with those of the people confronted in a particular situation, with no deep commitment to this or any other particular set of values.(20, pp.355-361).

Though most schools do not have professional psychiatrists and psychologists in residence, all have some counseling and guidance personnel. There are two categories of counselors: regular school counselors, and "instructional" or dormitory aides. Unfortunately, most of these people have had no training to engage in personal counseling. There are also supervisory aides who oversee the dormitory programs; some of these may be qualified to counsel. For example, at Oglala, two full-time counselors work in the dormitories (18, p. 386). At Intermountain, there are fifteen supervisory instructional aides; they organize the recreation program and carry out other duties (61, pp. 368-369). The two individuals in charge of the dormitories at Busby have had graduate work in counseling and guidance, but

both are too busy with administrative and disciplinary work to do counseling (24, p. 289). This is the case in many of the dormitories: trained people who could function as counselors are forced to act primarily as supervisors and disciplinarians. It has been suggested that, if the role of a "counselor" becomes defined primarily in terms of the discipline function, it is unlikely that students will trust and confide in him.

The guidance and counseling program in the schools supplements the counseling done (or not done) in the dormitories to some extent. Regular school counselors frequently provide special information and advice on post high school programs, careers, summer jobs, etc. At Oglala, the investigators commended the counseling and guidance service in the high school. Faculty and students both support it, and students generally "walk in" on their own for help (18, p. 386). At Albuquerque, the counselor-student ratio is fairly good, though some students still felt that they were not sufficiently available. A new director of guidance is initiating a program which, he claims, should result in better "cultural awareness and sensitivity" on the part of teachers. (45, p. 276). At Intermountain, as at several other schools, the guidance department provides a placement service for students. In addition to placing students in full-time jobs and training situations, they help find weekend and summer employment for students. Intermountain also provides special curricular programs for under-achieving students and those with special education problems (61, pp. 366-369).

At other schools, the counseling and guidance program does not appear to meet the needs at all. At Chilocco, Zellers notes, "Counseling is minimal--at best. This involves little personal counseling and practically nothing in vocational and career advisement. . . Less than even minimal psychological counseling is evident."(61, p. 310). At Flandreau, the guidance office has considerable test information on students, but provides very little career counseling (12, p. 332). At Busby, the principal informed the evaluators that there was no money available to compile student records, and there is practically no counseling of any kind (24, p. 290).

Several investigators have recommended various changes in the boarding schools to accommodate the special problems of their students. In their report on Flandreau, Hamilton, Petrafeso and Christenson state:

> Flandreau, as Pierre, appears to be operated solely by educators for students referred to the school by social workers. . . Staffing patterns should be adjusted to the needs of the pupils. If the schools continue to be operated for children in trouble of one kind or another, the proportion of educational specialists capable of remedial instruction, social welfare, guidance, counseling, analysis and recreation should be sharply stepped up. . . If schools assume a parental role and provide a home, they should be vastly more concerned for the hours of pupils outside the classroom. . .(12, pp.332-333).

Dr. Robert Leon has been especially critical of existing programs or non-programs: he has recommended that "the total system be overhauled and mental health personnel be placed at high administrative levels in Washington, in area offices, and in the schools themselves." He feels that only through placing these persons in positions of power can a truly comprehensive mental health program with the aim of preventing psychological problems be accomplished. To help in "repairing" the damage already done, however, he recommends that many boarding schools be converted into "residential treatment centers for emotionally disturbed children." (23, pp.2154-2155).

Not all agree that this is the best course to take with the boarding schools. In responding to a similar suggestion that the Bureau of Indian Affairs send students to particular schools based on their particular academic and emotional abilities or disabilities, the BIA noted that such homogeneous grouping would create other problems:

(a) On what basis or by what criteria will a student's aptitude and emotional, physical, and mental well-being be measured for placement?

(b) How will transportation and contact with the home, which is all too often minimal, be accomplished under this plan?

(c) The segregation of the present situation would be heightened to the point that students might seldom encounter much individual diversity in interests, abilities, etc.(53, p.2252).

Dr. Robert Bergman has offered an alternative to Leon's suggestion of inserting professional mental health personnel at all levels of the bureaucracy. He feels that the essential matter is to greatly increase the number of dormitory personnel and give them elementary training in counseling. Recruiting a large number of professionals would be difficult in the first place, he argues, and, once hired, they could not work effectively. Individual therapy would not reach many students, and attempts to change the role of the dormitory aides will fail as long as there are so few aides to handle the situation. He concludes:

> With the same money that would be necessary to hire a force of professionals, a more effective force of para-professionals could be recruited. . .There are lots of potential good dormitory attendants living near the schools already. I think that in many ways these people would be more valuable than professionals from outside the community. The local people know the children, their language and their ways, and the children trust them more readily. . . Hiring professional counselors without helping the aides to have more time to work with the children would be another effective step in convincing the aides that they are supposed to be drill sergeants and floor polishers but not substitute parents (5, p. 1130).

The government is definitely trying to improve its programs in these regards. The Public Health Service, Division of Indian Health, reported that, in 1967, regular psychiatric consultations were available for students in

twelve of the larger boarding schools (3, p. 2195). In 1970, fourteen psychiatrists were attached to the Indian Health Service, and many worked closely with the boarding schools. The BIA is also making efforts to increase the number of instructional aides in dormitories, requesting money to hire seventy additional aides in Fiscal Year 1969, with continuing increases each year through 1974 (53, p. 2252).

In addition to the efforts to meet the emotional needs of Indian students, various projects to identify and deal with special educational needs have been planned (53, p. 2201). The Institute of American Indian Arts has already been mentioned; it is oriented toward developing pride in and creative work from an identity and a heritage about which many Indian students have ambivalent or even negative feelings. According to the Director of the Institute:

> At the outset and at a very personal level, he (the student) is made aware of the fact that we know, in general, what his problems are, and that we are on hand to discuss them with him and look into what can be done to help in his particular circumstances; he is made aware of the fact that we respect him both as an individual and as an Indian, and that we cherish his cultural traditions (34, p. 1370).

Another special institution, the Concho Demonstration School in Oklahoma, was operated in 1968 to work with students who had special educational problems. According to a 1968 Bureau report:

> The school staff conducted a remedial program designed to reorient the student to the school he left or to a school more in keeping with his needs and objectives (56, p. 5).

Unfortunately, the school only has a capacity of 44 pupils. Nevertheless, it is clear that some efforts are being made to improve the Bureau's educational services to Indians. The constant problem of funding delays progress considerably in these matters.

Achievement in and After School

Though the means must be judged on their own merits, it is also important to consider the results of the educational process. First is the question of academic achievement as measured by standardized tests. These are valid only as a measure of achievement in the standard American curriculum, of course, and in no sense are they measures of "intelligence" or "knowledge." However, in that achievement in the standard American curriculum is highly correlated with later success in the American economic system, and in that such success is a goal of many Indians and educators of Indians, it is important to consider these results.

As a basis for evaluating the achievement of Indian students in federal boarding schools, we shall first consider the achievement levels of Indian youngsters in the sixth, ninth, and twelfth grades of federal and public schools. Data on this come from the 1966 report on Equality of Educational Opportunity,

by James S. Coleman, et al. His findings on the approximate grade level retardation of Indian students as compared with non-metropolitan whites in the South, Southwest, and North are summarized in the following table (9, pp. 274-275).

Approximate Number of Grade Levels Behind Non-Metropolitan Whites of Indian Americans

Grade	6	9	12
Verbal Ability	1.3	1.5	2.4
Reading Comprehension	1.7	1.8	2.5
Mathematics Achievement	1.6	2.0	2.9

When compared with Mexican-Americans, Puerto Ricans, or Negroes, Indian students at all levels do slightly better on achievement tests. On the other hand, when compared with metropolitan whites, Indian students are even farther behind (9, p. 219).

It is clear that Indian students as a whole do poorly when compared with national norms on school achievement. Against this background, we can examine the achievement of Indian students in certain off-reservation boarding schools. At the Busby Indian school, nine of thirteen graduating seniors scored in the lowest tenth on the California Achievement Test (24, p. 292). At Chilocco, a random sample of forty C.A.T. scores yielded the following results (57, p. 306).

	Mean Scores		Approximate Retardation	
Subject	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 10	Grade 11
Mathematics	7.5	8.0	3.0	3.5
Reading	8.5	9.2	2.0	2.3
Language	9.6	10.2	0.9	1.3
Battery average	8.7	9.2	1.8	2.3

At the Stewart Indian school, the results of the testing of one hundred or more students in each grade with the California Achievement Test indicated that students in grades six and seven were roughly one year behind in grade level; students in grades eight and nine were approximately one and one-half grade levels behind, students in grades ten and eleven were about two and one-half grade levels behind, and students in grade twelve were approximately three and one-half grade levels behind (35, p. 418).

Indian students in these schools seem to get progressively further behind as they proceed through the upper grades, despite the fact that the less interested students are dropping out as they reach the higher grades. A chart showing the achievement lag behind national norms of approximately 22,000 Indian pupils in BIA schools shows essentially the same pattern (48, p. 62).

Grade	Mean Achievement Lag
2	0.5
3	1.0
4	1.2
5	1.4
6	1.8
7	1.9
8	2.1
9	1.6
10	2.0
11	1.9
12	2.8

These figures are roughly comparable with those for Indian students in federal and public schools given in the Coleman report. It is apparent that Indian students as a group are less able to demonstrate knowledge of facts and skills on tests given in the English language than white students and thus appear to drop further and further behind as they progress through school.

Another measure of Indian boarding schools is the dropout rate. The 1967 statistics of the Bureau of Indian Affairs reveal a 40 percent dropout of students entering high school. The national average is 26 percent (48, p.59). The Indian dropout rate varies from school to school, however. A table of dropout rates for BIA and public schools in several Southwestern states gives the percentages of Indian students who enrolled in 8th grade in BIA and public schools in 1962 and failed to graduate from high school by 1968:

	Total Indian Students Who Dropped Out after Enrolling in a BIA School for 8th Grade in 1962		Total Indian Students Who Dropped Out after Enrolling in a Public School for 8th Grade in 1962	
State	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Arizona	33	39.7	68	31.7
Nevada	5	25.0	10	38.4
New Mexico	15	32.6	87	32.2
Oklahoma	27	49.1	158	44.0

All of these dropout rates, with the exception of BIA students in Nevada, are higher than the national average. The dropout rate for public schools is lower than the rate for BIA schools in Arizona and Oklahoma, though the two rates are the same in New Mexico (36, pp. 9-12). In comparing achievement or dropout rates of BIA and public schools, of course, we must remember that BIA schools get a large number of "problem" and academically retarded children.

Another means of evaluating schools is to examine what happens to students who graduate from them. Unfortunately, follow-up data on graduates of BIA schools are often poor. The evidence we have suggests that 28 percent of the BIA high school graduates enter college (the national norm is 50 percent); of these students, only 28 percent graduate (48, pp. 59-60). Reports from Albuquerque and Busby indicate that a majority of graduating students who did not start college started vocational-technical training. Of the 244 students who graduated from the Oglala Community School between 1961 and 1966, 21 percent went on to college, though less than one-third of them graduated. More graduates went on to some form of vocational training than went to college, but we have no exact figures on this. Fourteen percent went into military service (18, p. 387). Flandreau successfully followed up their ninety-six 1968 graduates in October, 1968; the status of these graduates is given in the following table (44, p. 335):

Status	Number	Percent
College	12	12.5
Vocational School	17	17.7
Employed	9	9.4
Unemployed*	31	32.3
Other	4	4.2
Armed Forces	8	8.3
Married	4	4.2
Unknown	11	11.4

*Twenty-one of those unemployed have made plans to take AVT at Haskell Institute starting the second semester.

The best follow-up study to date is the one conducted by the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. Their report on Indian students who graduated from high school in 1962 from schools in Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, North Dakota and South Dakota was done in 1968. It includes the following data:

Type of Post High School Program Begun by Indian Graduates of Public and Federal High Schools

Type of School	N	Type of Program*					
		Vocational-Technical		College		Junior College	
Public Schools		N	%	N	%	N	%
Female	53	39	73	18	34	7	13
Male	61	39	64	34	56	18	30
Total	114	78	68	52	46	25	22
Federal Schools							
Female	34	31	91	10	29	2	6
Male	30	29	96	8	27	4	14
Total	64	60	94	18	28	6	9

*Many students began more than one type of post-high school program; approximately 30 percent of public school graduates and 28 percent of federal school graduates transferred to a second program before completing one or dropping out, and some even went on to a third.

Completion Rates for Programs in Post High School Institutions Entered by Indian Graduates of Public and Federal High Schools

Type of School	N	Type of Program						Total Completions	
		Voc-Tech		College		Junior College			
Public Schools		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Female	53	17	44	6	33	2	29	25	45
Male	61	19	49	10	29	5	28	34	56
Total	114	36	46	16	31	7	28	59	52
Federal Schools									
Female	34	11	35	5	50	1	50	17	50
Male	30	13	43	2	25	1	25	16	53
Total	64	24	38	7	39	2	33	33	52

These tables demonstrate (1) that Indian graduates of BIA schools were less likely to enter college than Indian graduates of public schools; and (2) that the completion rates for vocational-technical programs were lower for graduates of BIA schools than for public school graduates, but completion rates for college and junior college were higher for graduates of BIA schools (43, pp. 18-22).

The final aspect of Indian education which needs examination in a review of the results of the educational process is the psycho-social adjustment of Indian adults who have gone to boarding schools. There is considerable literature on Indian problems of psychological and social adjustment, but it is very difficult to determine to what extent particular psycho-social problems are due to the educational experience of Indian children and to what extent they are due to other economic, political, cultural, and social factors of the Indian and the dominant American society. A suggestion from Robert Bergman's paper on psychological problems of Indian boarding schools raises the possibility that the boarding school experience itself contributes significantly to the problems of Indian adults:

> Among the young adults who are the first generation of Navajos in which the majority went to school, there are many severe problems. The problems that occur with excessive frequency are ones involving the breakdown of social control: drunkenness, child neglect, and drunken and reckless driving. Alarming numbers of people have lapsed into an alienated, apathetic life marked by episodes of delinquency and irresponsibility. . . I have encountered many mothers who take the attitude that they should not have to be burdened with their children and that the

> hospital or some other institution should care for them. It seems a reasonable hypothesis that their having been placed by their own parents in an impersonal institution contributes to such attitudes. . .(6, p. 1126).

The accuracy of Bergman's observations and the validity of his hypothesis both need more investigation, for the relation of adult emotional and social adjustment to school experience is poorly understood. Moreover, many of the young adult Navajos to whom he refers were educated in the Navajo Special Education Program, which provided a five-to-eight year vocational program for adolescents between the ages of twelve and twenty. Thus, it is not the case that all of these young adults were put in boarding schools at a very young age. The effects of this kind of early experience on psychological and social adjustment, therefore, are still not clear.

THE ADMINISTRATION OF FEDERAL BOARDING SCHOOLS

Federal boarding schools are operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The Bureau of Indian Affairs is divided into three echelons: (1) the Central offices in Washington. These include the offices of the Commissioner, Deputy Commissioner, and Assistant Commissioners. One of the latter is the Assistant Commissioner for Education. His office, like the others, is divided into several sections and divisions. Each office, as well as each section and division within an office, has staff authority over counterparts in the two lower echelons. (2) The second echelon is the Area Office. There are eleven of these, each headed by a Director, and each including an Assistant Area Director for Education. (3) The third echelon includes the Agency Superintendents on the reservations and officials in various branches and divisions under the Superintendents. The school superintendents of on-reservation boarding schools are under the Agency Superintendent; the school superintendents of off-reservation boarding schools are directly under the appropriate Area Office (17, pp. 1449-1451). Much of the policy-making power, it turns out, lies in the Area Office, particularly with the Area Director. In particular, he appears to have much control over which programs in various schools will be funded. Osview stresses that this man is a professional manager, not an educator; most Area Directors have no relevant training or expertise in the field of education (37, pp. 290-293). Moreover, the long line of authority from school principal to Agency Superintendent to Area branch officer to Area Director to the Assistant Commissioner for Education to the Commissioner of the Bureau in Washington makes communication difficult and innovation unlikely.

One of the apparently less fortunate aspects of this system of administration is the recruitment of teachers for federal schools. This is done by the Teacher Recruitment Office of the BIA. Applications are reviewed by this office and the Interagency Board of U. S. Civil Service Examiners. Teachers are given a civil service rating, hired, and assigned to schools in the BIA system according to the particular needs of each school (4, pp. 75-80). In most cases, the principal of a BIA school knows nothing about the teachers

sent to his school, nor do teachers know much about the school to which they are being sent. For instance, the investigators at the Stewart Indian School reported:

> The principal of Stewart has no authority in the selection of teachers for the school. Instead he is dependent on an Area Office selection from a limited service registry. Thus, there is no possibility for choosing teachers with special backgrounds for enrichment programs, nor safeguards against incompetents (35, p.418).

Another possible drawback of the Bureau school system may stem from the lack of communication between levels of the administrative structure and from general indecisiveness of policymakers at all levels. This is the lack of consensus on the purpose and goals of the BIA schools. The investigating team at Pierre and Flandreau reported:

> At the risk of oversimplification, there appear to be two related problems: the amount of confusion permitted to exist around the purpose for which these schools exist, and the consequent inability of anyone to develop an adequate program under these circumstances (12, p.344).

Members of the Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory found that three documents outlining the philosophy of the Albuquerque school existed: one prepared by the office of the Assistant Commissioner for Education in Washington, one by the Area Office, and one by the administration and staff of Albuquerque Indian school (45, p.265). We have noted previously, of course, the additional confusion over the relative importance of academic vs. vocational training in many schools.

The Question of Local Control

One alternative to this system of administration which has been discussed lately is the granting of control of federal Indian schools to Indian people. This issue is too large to go into in detail here. Various suggestions have been made, including the creation of a "National Indian Board of Indian Education," the establishment of local Indian boards of education, the transfer of all or some responsibility for federal schools to local or tribal boards of education, and increasing the number of Indian teachers, administrators, and policymakers in federal schools and in the Bureau of Indian Affairs itself. (cf.48, pp. 117-121, 59, and 25, pp. 1599-1706).

Many Indian leaders have been calling for greater involvement of Indian people in running their own affairs, particularly since the American Indian "Chicago Conference" of June, 1961, at which a "Declaration of Indian Purpose" stating the desire of Indians to participate in developing their own programs was drawn up by Indian leaders.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs has been responding to these suggestions, albeit slowly. In 1967 a sixteen-member, all-Indian "National Indian Education Advisory Committee" was created to work with the Commissioner and the Assistant Commissioner for Education in an advisory capacity. The Bureau also directed the Area Offices to see to it that advisory school boards of Indians were established. As of May, 1969, 174 of the Bureau's 222 schools had advisory boards (54, p. 1501), though there is evidence that a substantial number of these do not function. In addition, the BIA started "Project TRIBE," a plan by which full control over the operation of a federal school can be turned over to an Indian community once it forms a local school board. Such a school would still be funded at the normal level by the BIA (54, p. 1501). To facilitate this process, the Bureau has assembled materials on the functions and duties of school boards and has also held a "School Board Workshop" for Indian community leaders. To date, however, only two schools have been turned over to Indian communities: Rough Rock on the Navajo Reservation and the Blackwater Day School on the Pima Reservation. An account of some of the problems involved in such a transfer is included in "Who Should Control Indian Education," by McKinley, Bayne, and Nimnicht; in it they describe the history of the abortive attempt of some residents of the White Clay District of the Pine Ridge Sioux Reservation to take control of the Loneman Day School.

Currently, interest is growing among some communities in organizing and administering schools under the contract arrangements provided for in Project TRIBE. Dillon Platero has said that five more Navajo communities are preparing to take control over their schools following the example of Rough Rock. This system is seen as having the advantage of freedom from the constraints of traditional BIA management procedures.

Before concluding this brief examination of the issue of the administration of Indian education, it should be noted that many Indian leaders are favorably disposed toward BIA boarding schools at this time. Several reasons account for this position. Among them are jobs which the boarding schools provide for Indian people, fears over the termination of federal services which the closing of boarding schools would stimulate, and the familiarity with the boarding school system which many Indians have. In addition, many leaders are concerned about the problems which will face families for whom boarding schools provide assistance in the form of food and shelter for their children.

Several Indian leaders have spoken out in favor of boarding schools. Enos Poorbear, President of the Oglala Sioux, in appraising the education program on Pine Ridge, stressed that his Tribal Executive Committee felt that measurable progress is being made in solving the educational problems of the reservation. He presented a report which concluded:

> In other words, efforts at Pine Ridge Agency to improve the quality of education for Indian children have not been totally ineffective, considering the social and economic status of many of the parents of our students. . . If improvements are made to alleviate some of the more serious problems stemming from socioeconomic conditions, the education program could then institute effectively changes to be described in this Report under "Recommendations."(39, pp. 1269-1270).

The recommendations referred to involve increased involvement of parents, including establishing and training advisory school boards, and the improvement and expansion of boarding facilities to serve students in isolated areas of the reservation and students from broken homes (39, pp.1272-1277). Domingo Montoya, Chairman of the All-Indian Pueblo Council, stated that he preferred federal schools to public schools for young Indian children because they need special language instruction (30, p. 93). The Navajo Social Action Group, while recognizing the "many negative experiences that affect young people in boarding schools," nevertheless stressed the necessity of these schools at the present time (47, pp. 56-57).

These and other Indian leaders recognize the many problems associated with the federal boarding schools, and they have suggested many changes in curricula, teacher training, pupil personnel services, dormitory arrangements, and location of the schools. They are aware that these schools serve several important functions, including the provision of some special programs for the special needs of many Indian children, employment of many Indian people, and the provision of food, clothing, medical care, and shelter to many children whose families would have great difficulty in providing for. These Indians have also stressed their desire for a real voice in the making of decisions concerning Indian education. With an attitude of understanding and a commitment to cooperation, the Bureau of Indian Affairs should be able to work with such people in providing a good education for Indian children as long as it is desired by Indians that they do so.

Bibliography

1. Abt Associates. "Systems Analysis, Program Development, and Cost Effectiveness Modeling of Indian Education for the Bureau of Indian Affairs." Cambridge, Mass.: Abt Associates, Inc., 1968, as quoted in Special Subcommittee on Indian Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, United States Senate. Indian Education: A National Tragedy--A National Challenge. Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1969.

2. Adams, Evelyn C. American Indian Education, Government Schools and Economic Progress. New York City: King's Crown Press, 1946.

3. Andrews, Marion. "Mental Health Activities in the Indian Health Program," n.d., as reprinted in Special Subcommittee on Indian Education. Indian Education, Part 5. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969, pp. 2193-2199.

4. Ault, Michael. "Teacher Recruitment Program Recommendations," Sixth Monthly Progress Report, Systems Analysis, Program Development, and Cost-Effectiveness Modeling of Indian Education for the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Cambridge, Mass.: Abt Associates, Inc., 1968, pp. 75-84.

5. Bergman, Robert L. "A Second Report on the Problems of Boarding Schools," paper presented to the May, 1968 Meeting of the American Academy of Pediatrics Committee on Indian Health, as printed in Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, Indian Education, Part 3. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969, pp. 1128-1133.

6. _____. "Boarding Schools and Psychological Problems of Indian Children," paper presented to the May, 1967 Meeting of the American Academy of Pediatrics Committee on Indian Health, as printed in Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, Indian Education, Part 3. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969, pp. 1121-1128.

7. Bjork, John. "Trip Report, Flandreau Indian School and Pierre Indian School," in Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, A Compendium of Federal Boarding School Evaluations. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969, pp. 336-351.

8. Byler, William. "Memorandum Re Enrollments in Bureau of Indian Affairs Boarding Schools and Dormitories, Ages 9 and Under," n.d., as printed in Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, Indian Education, Part 1. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969, pp. 74-78.

9. Coleman, James S., et. al. Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

10. Elité, Anthony E. letter to Senator Robert Kennedy on the Phoenix Boarding School, February 23, 1968, as printed in Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, A Compendium of Federal Boarding School Evaluations. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969, pp. 392-394.

11. Erickson, Donald, and Henrietta Schwartz. Community School at Rough Rock. Washington: U. S. Office of Economic Opportunity, April, 1969.

12. Hamilton, Francis, Peter Petrafeso, and Rosemary Christenson. "Flandreau and Pierre Indian Schools," in Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, A Compendium of Federal Boarding School Evaluations. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969, pp. 324-334.

13. Havighurst, Robert J. "Visit to Sherman Institute." Unpublished memorandum, December, 1968.

14. Hill, Clarence M., Ethel Lee Jewell, and Von H. Robertson. Report of Survey of Three Off-Reservation Indian Schools Whose Curriculum Included the Special Indian Education Program. Washington: U. S. Bureau of Indian Affairs, n.d.

15. Holmes, Graham. letter and materials to Subcommittee on Indian Education, December 10, 1968, as quoted in Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, Field Investigation and Research Reports. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969.

16. Hovis, Richard. "Report of Student-Teaching Experience at Chilocco Federal Indian School," in Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, A Compendium of Federal Boarding School Evaluations. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969, pp. 317-323.

17. Josephy, Alvin M. "The American Indian and the Bureau of Indian Affairs--1969," memorandum to Mr. James Keogh, February 11, 1969, as printed in Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, Indian Education, Part 2. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969, pp. 1421-1459.

18. Koch, Harold, and Bert Speece. "Evaluation of Oglala Community Boarding School," in Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, A Compendium of Federal Boarding School Evaluations. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969, pp. 382-391.

19. Krush, Thaddeus P., and John Bjork. "Mental Health Factors in an Indian Boarding School," Mental Hygiene, January, 1965, as reprinted in Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, Indian Education, Part 5. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969, pp. 2211-2218.

20. _____, John Bjork, Peter S. Sindell, and Joanna Nelle. "Some Thoughts on the Formation of Personality Disorder: Study of an Indian Boarding School Population," American Journal of Psychiatry, Vol. 122 No. 8, February, 1966, as reprinted in Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, A Compendium of Federal Boarding School Evaluations. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969, pp. 351-362.

21. Leon, Robert L. "Mental Health Gonsiderations in the Indian Boarding School Program," talk given June 19, 1958, as reprinted in Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, Indian Education, Part 5. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969, pp. 2203-2208.

22. Leon, Robert L. "Report on Site Visit to the Chilocco Indian School," in Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, A Compendium of Federal Boarding School Evaluations. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969, pp. 298-308.

23. _____. Statement to the Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, October 1, 1968, as printed in Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, Indian Education, Part 5. Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1969, pp. 2151-2168.

24. McDonald, Arthur, and William Bliss. "Evaluation of Bureau of Indian Affairs Boarding School, Busby, Montana," in Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, A Compendium of Federal Boarding School Evaluations. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969, pp. 283-327.

25. McKinley, Francis, Stephen Bayne, and Glen Nimnicht. "Who Should Control Indian Education?" as printed in Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, Indian Education, Part 2. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969, pp. 1599-1706.

26. Meriam, Lewis, et. al. The Problem of Indian Administration. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1928.

27. Michener, Bryan. "Shonto, Arizona." Unpublished memorandum, 1969.

28. _____. "Shonto Boarding School and Community, Shonto, Arizona." Unpublished report for National Study of American Indian Education, 1970.

29. Mondale, Senator Walter. Testimony on October 1, 1968, as printed in Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, Indian Education, Part 5. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969, pp. 2133-2134.

30. Montoya, Domingo. "Prepared Statement," as printed in Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, Indian Education, Part 1. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969, pp. 92-97.

31. Nakai, Raymond. Letter to Chairman, Subcommittee on Indian Education, n.d., as printed in Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, Indian Education, Part 5. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969, p. 2184.

32. Nash, Philleo, "An Historical Perspective--A Selective Review and Critical Evaluation of Earlier Research Efforts on American Indian Education," in Aurbach, ed., Proceedings of the National Research Conference on American Indian Education. Society for the Study of Social Problems, Kalamazoo, Michigan, 1967.

33. Navajo Area Office, U. S. Bureau of Indian Affairs. "Something about Navajo Education, School Year 1968-69," mimeo, n.d., as quoted in Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, Field Investigation and Research Reports. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969.

34. New, Lloyd. "Institute of American Indian Arts, Cultural Difference as the Basis for Creative Education," U. S. Department of the Interior, Indian Arts and Crafts Board, n.d., as reprinted in Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, Indian Education, Part 2. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969, pp. 1365-1372.

35. Nimnicht, Glen, Francis McKinley, and Stephen Bayne. "A Report to the Senate Subcommittee on the Stewart Boarding School," in Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, A Compendium of Federal Boarding School Evaluations. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969, pp. 417-421.

36. Owens, Charles S., and Willard P. Bass. The American Indian High School Dropout in the Southwest. Albuquerque: Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory, Inc., 1969.

37. Osview, Leon. "A Report of an Analysis of Administrative Structure, Budgeting Practice, and Certain Personnel Factors of the Bureau of Indian Affairs as They Pertain to the Education Function," memorandum to the Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, as printed in Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, Indian Education, Part I. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969, pp. 289-300.

38. Parmee, Edward A. A Modern Apache Indian Community and Government Education Programs. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, no date given, as reprinted in part in Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, Indian Education, Part 3. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969, pp. 1141-1228.

39. Pine Ridge Agency, Branch of Education, United States Bureau of Indian Affairs. "An Appraisal of the Pine Ridge Education Program, Pine Ridge, South Dakota," n.d., as reprinted in Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, Indian Education, Part 4. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969, pp. 1269-1283.

40. Pratt, Richard Henry. Battlefield and Classroom. Robert M. Otley, ed. and Introduction. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1964.

41. Roessel, Robert. Statement read to the Subcommittee on Indian Education, October 1, 1968, as printed in Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, Indian Education, Part 1. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969, pp. 12-20.

42. Saslow, Harry L., and May J. Harrover. "Research on Psychosocial Adjustment of Indian Youth," The American Journal of Psychiatry, Vol. 125, No. 2, August, 1968, as reprinted in Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, Indian Education, Part 5. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969, pp. 2116-2123.

43. Selinger, Alphonse D. The American Indian Graduate--After High School, What? Portland, Oregon: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1968.

44. Sneve, Virginia. "Flandreau Indian School," in Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, A Compendium of Federal Boarding School Evaluations. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969, pp. 334-336.

45. Southwestern Cooperative Education Laboratory. "Report on the Albuquerque Indian School," in Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, A Compendium of Federal Boarding School Evaluations. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969, pp. 263-282.

46. Special Subcommittee on Indian Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, United States Senate. A Compendium of Federal Boarding School Evaluations. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, November, 1969.

47. _____. Field Investigation and Research Reports. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, October, 1969.

48. _____. Indian Education: A National Tragedy--A National Challenge. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, November, 1969.

49. _____. Indian Education: Hearings before the Subcommittee on Indian Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, United States Senate. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969.

50. Spicer, Edward H. Comments, as printed in Aurbach, ed., Proceedings of the National Research Conference on American Indian Education. Kalamazoo, Michigan: Society for the Study of Social Problems, 1967, pp. 35-39.

51. Svenson, Elvin V. "Special Evaluation and Report on Sherman Institute," in Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, A Compendium of Federal Boarding School Evaluations. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969.

52. Thompson, Hildegard. "Education among American Indians: Institutional Aspects," in The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol. 311, May, 1957, pp. 95-104.

53. United States Bureau of Indian Affairs. "Progress Report on Recommendations of the American Academy of Pediatrics, Committee on Indian Health Meeting," n.d., as printed in Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, Indian Education, Part 5. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969, pp. 2252-2268.

54. _____. "Questions from Senator Mondale," as printed in Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, Indian Education, Part 2. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969.

55. United States Bureau of Indian Affairs, Division of Education. Statistics Concerning Indian Education, Fiscal Year 1956. Lawrence, Kansas: Publications Service, Haskell Institute, 1956.

56. _____. Statistics Concerning Indian Education, Fiscal Year 1968. Lawrence, Kansas: Publications Service, Haskell Institute, 1968.

57. Valencia, Atilano. "A Report on Curriculum and Instruction in the Chilocco Indian Boarding School," in Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, A Compendium of Federal Boarding School Evaluations. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969.

58. Wauneka, Annie. Testimony before the Subcommittee on Indian Education, March 30, 1968, as printed in Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, Indian Education, Part 3. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969.

59. Wax, Murray, Rosalie Wax, and Robert Dumont, Jr. "Formal Education in an American Indian Community," Social Problems, Vol. 11, No. 4, 1964.

60. Zellers, Charles. "Chilocco Indian School, Oklahoma, Program Review Report," in Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, A Compendium of Federal Boarding School Evaluations. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969, pp. 308-317.

61. Zellers, Charles. "Program Review Report, Intermountain Indian School," in Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, A Compendium of Federal Boarding School Evaluations. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1969.

62. Van Duzen, Jean, James P. Carter, John Secondi and Charles Federspiel. "Protein and Calorie Malnutrition Among Preschool Navajo Indian Children," American Journal of Clinical Nutrition, vol. 22, October, 1969, pp. 1362-1370.

63. Frederiksen, Michael J. and Barbara S. McDonald. "Anemia in Navajo Indian Children." Mimeographed Research Paper, U. S. Public Health Service, Window Rock, Arizona, 1967.